

Comparison of Realizations of the Terrestrial Reference Frame

C. Ma

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, USA, 20771

D. MacMillan, S. Bolotin, K. Le Bail, D. Gordon, and J. Gipson

NVI, Inc. and NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, USA, 20771

Abstract. IGN and DGFI both generated realizations of the terrestrial reference frame under the auspices of the IERS from combination of the same space geodetic data. We compared the IGN and DGFI TRFs with a GSFC CALC/SOLVE TRF. WRMS position and velocity differences for the 40 most frequently observed sites were 2-3 mm and 0.3-0.4 mm/y. There was a scale difference of -0.39 ppb/ -0.09 ppb between the IGN/DGFI realizations and the GSFC solution. When we fixed positions and velocities to either the IGN or DGFI values in CALC/SOLVE solutions, the resulting EOP estimates were not significantly different from the estimates from a standard TRF solution.

Keywords. Radio wave technique, terrestrial reference frame, space geodesy

1 Introduction

Recently IGN generated ITRF2008 the latest version of the IERS international terrestrial reference frame. This frame is a combination solution based on input from the VLBI, SLR, GPS, and DORIS technique combination analysis centers. For this realization of the TRF (Terrestrial Reference Frame), the input consisted of the technique EOP (Earth orientation parameters) and station position time series as well as the available site tie vectors. To provide an alternative to cross-check the IGN solution, DGFI also generated a combination TRF, ITRF2008D from the same input data available to IGN.

In this paper we evaluate ITRF2008 and ITRF2008D, by comparing them with CALC/SOLVE (Ma et al., 1990) VLBI TRF solutions and by investigating the effects of applying the two versions of ITRF2008 in VLBI solutions. Essentially, we investigate how well the VLBI information provided to the combination is

recovered. In section 2, we directly compare the site positions and velocities from the IGN and DGFI solutions with those from a standard VLBI solution. In section 3, we examine the EOP series estimated from solutions in which the TRF positions and velocities are not estimated but are instead fixed to ITRF2008 or ITRF2008D. In section 4, we summarize our conclusions.

2 Comparisons of TRFs

For our comparisons, we ran an operational-type VLBI TRF quarterly solution with the CALC/SOLVE software using data from 1979 until February 2010. The solution estimated global positions and velocities from the entire time period as well as EOP. We then compared this VLBI TRF with the positions and velocities extracted from the IGN and DGFI ITRF2008 SINEX files. Tables 1 and 2 show the position and velocity Helmert 7-parameter transformation values between the VLBI TRF and the IGN or DGFI TRFs. One significant difference is the scale difference of -0.39 ± 0.15 ppb for the IGN solution. For DGFI, the scale difference was only -0.09 ± 0.10 ppb for DGFI. Translating to site vertical, the IGN discrepancy corresponds to about 2.5 mm. The scale differences must arise from the treatment of scale in the respective combinations. IGN found an SLR-VLBI scale difference of -1.05 ± 0.13 ppb and for the combination, they weighted the VLBI and SLR scales equally (Altamimi et al., 2010; this proceedings). In contrast, DGFI found essentially no difference in VLBI and SLR scale so that the difference in scale between the ITRF2008D and VLBI (SLR) was 0.01 ± 0.03 ppb (0.02 ± 0.03 ppb) respectively (Seitz et al, 2010, this proceedings). The IGN (DGFI) velocity transformation parameters are all less than 0.6 (0.3) mm/yr, where the formal uncertainties are ~ 0.1 mm/yr.

Table 1. 7-Parameter Position Transformation at epoch 2005





	IGN - VLBI	DGFI - VLBI
T_x (mm)	-0.04 ± 1.1	$+0.8 \pm 0.7$
T_y (mm)	-1.7 ± 1.0	-1.4 ± 0.7
T_z (mm)	$+0.8 \pm 0.9$	-0.5 ± 0.6
R_x (mm)	-5.7 ± 1.2	-5.9 ± 0.8
R_y (mm)	$+1.6 \pm 1.2$	$+0.3 \pm 0.8$
R_z (mm)	-1.9 ± 1.2	$+2.5 \pm 0.8$
Scale (ppb)	-0.39 ± 0.15	-0.09 ± 0.10

Table 2. 7-Parameter Velocity Transformation

	IGN - VLBI	DGFI - VLBI
\dot{T}_x (mm/y)	-0.39 ± 0.11	$+0.07 \pm 0.07$
\dot{T}_y (mm/y)	-0.56 ± 0.10	-0.13 ± 0.07
\dot{T}_z (mm/y)	-0.25 ± 0.10	-0.30 ± 0.08
\dot{R}_x (mm/y)	-0.27 ± 0.13	-0.30 ± 0.08
\dot{R}_y (mm/y)	$+0.00 \pm 0.12$	$+0.14 \pm 0.08$
\dot{R}_z (mm/y)	$+0.15 \pm 0.10$	-0.06 ± 0.08
Scale (ppb/y)	$+0.023 \pm 0.016$	-0.005 ± 0.010

After removing the effect of the 7-parameter transformations, there are some significant residual differences between the VLBI TRF and the two ITRF2008 solutions. In Figures 1-4, we show the horizontal and vertical residual differences for sites that observed in at least 20 observing sessions.

Differences less than 5 mm are indicated by open circles. The displacement vector differences for larger residuals are plotted. The largest differences for both ITRF2008 solutions are mainly for Japanese network sites and for US mobile VLBI sites, which observed in the 1980s and early 1990s.

**Fig. 1.** IGN (upper) and DGFI (lower) horizontal residual vectors (mm) relative to VLBI TRF solution.**Fig. 2.** IGN (upper) and DGFI (lower) vertical position (mm) relative to VLBI TRF solution.







Fig. 3. IGN (upper) and DGFI (lower) horizontal velocity vectors (mm/y) relative to the VLBI TRF solution

The residual 3D differences between the IGN/DGFI solution and the VLBI TRF solution were less than 10 mm for 49/45 sites and greater than 10 mm for 66/64 sites. The number of sessions for the 40 most frequently observed sites ranged from 123 to 2386 sessions. For these sites, the WRMS of the residual differences in ENU positions (velocities) for the IGN solution were 2.4 mm (0.3 mm/y), 1.6 mm (0.3 mm/y), and 2.8 mm (0.4 mm/y). For the DGFI solution the NEU residual WRMS values were 2.2 mm (0.3 mm/y), 1.8 mm (0.3 mm/y), and 3.1 mm (0.4 mm/y).

3 Effects of IGN and DGFI TRFs in VLBI Solutions

In our standard VLBI TRF solutions, we estimate a TRF along with EOP and a CRF (celestial reference frame). In this way EOP connects the estimated TRF and CRF in a self-consistent way. To evaluate the ITRF2008 solutions, we ran two additional solutions in which we fixed the positions and

Fig. 4. IGN (upper) and DGFI (lower) vertical rates (mm/y) relative to the VLBI TRF solution.

velocities to those in each of the two ITRF2008 solutions and then estimated EOP. For sites where there were episodic jumps, we applied the jumps given in the DGFI and IGN SINEX files. In the case of Fairbanks, where there was nonlinear postseismic motion after the Denali Earthquake in 2002, we applied the models determined by DGFI or IGN that each consisted of series of XYZ offsets and rates.

As expected, the overall solution fit was best for the standard VLBI solution (22.500 ps) since the TRF was estimated. Fixing the TRF to the DGFI *a priori* gave a solution residual WRMS fit of 22.650 ps, which was better than fixing to the IGN *a priori* which had a fit of 22.733 ps. The IGN 24-hr session fits were especially bad for a number Japanese network sessions. Generally the IGN and DGFI solution daily session WRMS residual fits were similar. Figure 5 shows the distribution of the (DGFI-IGN) differences in session fits. Solution fits were slightly better using the DGFI positions and

velocities. Typically, 24-hour session solution fits are 20-40 ps. However, the solution fits for many domestic Japanese network sessions were significantly worse for the IGN solution because some of the Japanese station positions (for example, AIRA, GIFU3, SINTOTU2, CHICHI10) were much different from the GSFC VLBI TRF positions as seen in Figure 1.




Fig. 5. Distribution of differences between 24-hour session fits for solutions in which the TRF was fixed to either the IGN or DGFI positions and velocities.

We compared EOP estimates from the three solutions (IGN, DGFI, VLBI TRF) with the IGS EOP time series. As summarized in Table 3, the agreement between the IGS series and the IGN and DGFI series are not significantly different. The IGS agreement with the GSFC VLBI TRF EOP series is slightly better. For X-pole and Y-pole, we also computed as a function of sampling time the Allan variance (Allan, 1966; Allan, 1987; Le Bail, 2006) of the differences between each of the 3 EOP series and the IGS series. The results shown in Figures 6 indicate that there is no significant difference (much less than 1-sigma) between the three solutions and the IGS series.

Table 3. EOP Differences with IGS EOP Series

	VLBI TRF		DGFI		IGN	
	WRMS	χ^2	WRMS	χ^2	WRMS	χ^2
X, μ as	115	3.1	118	3.9	117	3.8
Y, μ as	116	3.4	118	4.3	118	4.3
LOD, μ s/d	19.7	3.7	19.7	3.7	19.8	3.7




Fig. 6. Allan variances of X-pole and Y-pole differences between each of the solutions (VLBI TRF, IGN, DGFI) and the IGS series.

The Allan variance of the differences between polar motion estimates from the IGN or DGFI solutions and the GSFC VLBI TRF solution are shown in Figure 7. Given the formal uncertainties of the Allan variance, there is no significant difference in the agreement of the DGFI and IGN solutions with the TRF solution.




Fig. 7. Allan variance between IGN and DGFI solution EOP and VLBI TRF EOP.

4 Conclusions

We have compared the IGN and DGFI TRFs with the TRF estimated from a GSFC operational-type CALC-SOLVE solution. For the 40 most frequently participating stations, the WRMS differences are 2-3 mm in position components and 0.3-0.4 mm/y for velocity components. The scale difference between the GSFC TRF solution and the IGN/DGFI solution is -0.39 ppb/ -0.09 ppb. This IGN scale difference is occurs because IGN found a scale difference of

-1.05 ppb between the SLR and VLBI and input solutions and then weighted the two solutions equally in their combination. There are large differences between GSFC and DGFI and/or IGN positions/velocities for a large number of sites including Japanese domestic sites, mobile VLBI sites in North America that observed in the 1980s and early 1990s, and other VLBI stations that have not observed recently.

We also evaluated the effect of using the IGN or DGFI TRFs in CALC/SOLVE solutions. Fixing the positions and velocities to either IGN or DGFI solutions yield EOP series that agree with the IGS combined series equally well within formal uncertainties. The DGFI and IGN solution X-pole and Y-pole also agree equally well with formal uncertainties with a GSFC VLBI TRF solution where positions and velocities are estimated.

5 References

- Allan, D.W., Statistics of Atomic Frequency Standards, *Proc. IEEE*, 54, 221-231, 1966.
- Allan, D.W., Time and Frequency Characterization, Estimation and Prediction of Precision Clocks and Oscillators, *IEEE Trans. UFCC*, 34, 647-654, 1987.
- Altamimi, Z., X. Collilieux, and L. Métivier, ITRF Combination: Theoretical and Practical Considerations and Lessons from ITRF2008, REFAG2010, IAG Commission 1 Symposium, Marne la Vallée, October 2010.
- Le Bail, K., Estimating the Noise in Space-Geodetic Positioning. The Case of DORIS, *J. Geod.*, 80, 541-565, 2006.
- Ma, C., J. Sauber, L.J. Bell, T.A. Clark, D. Gordon, W.E. Himwich, and J.W. Ryan, Measurement of horizontal motions in Alaska using very long baseline interferometry, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 95(B13), 21991-22011, 1990.
- Seitz, M., D. Angermann, H. Drewes, Accuracy Assessment of ITRF2008D, REFAG2010, IAG Commission 1 Symposium, Marne la Vallée, October 2010.